UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,998	08/18/2003	John D. Hatlestad	GUID.058PA	2963
	7590 06/08/200 ORTH & FUNK, LLC	EXAMINER		
8009 34TH AVE S.			MUSSELMAN, TIMOTHY A	
SUITE 125 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55425			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3715	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/642,998	HATLESTAD ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	TIMOTHY MUSSELMAN	3715			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING THE MAILING THE METERS OF THE MAILING THE MAILING THE MAILING THE METERS OF THE METERS OF THE MAILING THE MAILING THE METERS OF THE METERS OF THE METERS OF THE METERS OF THE MAILING THE METERS OF THE METERS	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 M This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-12,14 and 35-46 is/are pending in the short claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-12,14 and 35-46 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	ar.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposition and accomposition and accomposition accomposition and accomposition accomposition and accomposition accomposition and accomposition acc	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. Seetion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/12/2009.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite			

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Applicants submission dated 3/12/2009 has been received, and claims 1-12, 14, and 35-46 are pending. Claims 13, 15-34, and 47-96 have been cancelled previously.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of the relevant portion of 35 U.S.C. 103 that forms the basis for the rejections made in this section of the office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Claims 1-12, 14, and 35-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen (US 5,520,176) in combination with Bardy (US 6,398,728) and 'Aircraft Noise and Sleep Disturbance: Final Report', prepared by the Civil Aviation Authority London on behalf of the Department of Trade, August 1980.

Regarding claims 1, 14, 35-36, **and 46**, Cohen discloses a system and methods for sleep quality data collection and analysis utilizing various measured physiological parameters. See col. 2: 33-59. Cohen fails to teach of utilizing non-physiological parameters in the research process. However, a *research* study conducted by the Civil Aviation Authority London published in 1980 pertains explicitly to this very subject. See page two, in the report summary, wherein it is described how aircraft noise was *measured* in

various London neighborhoods on aircraft approach paths to the two main London airports in order to better understand how the noise interfered with the *sleep processes* of residents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate background noise measurements (i.e. non-physiological parameter measurements) in the manner of the 1980 CAA *sleep quality research* project, into the *sleep research* System of Cohen, in order to expand the usefulness of the research system of Cohen to include cause and effect data pertaining to sleep problems.

Cohen additionally fails to teach wherein the collection and storing of sleep quality data occurs on the implantable device, and wherein the implantable device performs the evaluation, and also wherein the non-physiological data is collected external to the patient and transmitted to the implantable device (claims 36 and 46). However, Bardy discloses an implantable device utilized for research purposes that measures various parameters. See col. 8: 1-17. This citation describes an implantable analysis system, wherein the data can be collected, stored, and processed internally, externally, or transmitted between internal and external system components. Mazar also discloses wherein other data involved in the analysis can be transmitted to the internal implantable device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include such a distributed sensory and processing system, and particularly to have the processing occur internally to the patient, to improve the product in a manner as taught by Bardy, by allowing the device to process data and thus reducing the need for frequent external data analysis by a human (i.e. the device would transmit a derived measure, rather than simply raw data).

Regarding Claims 2-6 and 8-12, Cohen further discloses the detection and determination of metrics pertaining to; cardio-vascular conditions (Claim 2), see col. 6: 12-20; respiratory and disordered breathing conditions (claims 3, 11, 39, and 43), see col. 4: 3-10 and col. 4: 41-45; muscle system and movement disorder conditions (claims 4, 12, 40, and 44), see col. 8: 38-45; blood chemistry conditions (claim 5), see col. 5: 33-35; nervous system conditions (claim 6), See col. 8: 38-54; contextual conditions (claim 8),

Art Unit: 3715

see the provided citations for claims 2-6; and data pertaining to sleep stages and sleep disruptions (claims 9-10 and 37-38), See col. 7: 20-25.

Regarding claim 7, the detection of environmental conditions (e.g. background noise) for sleep research is an obvious variation of Cohen in view of the CAA report as described above with regard to claim 1.

Regarding claims 41-42, Cohen further discloses determining and trending the measured sleep quality metrics over time. See col. 3: 17-37.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments dated 3/12/2009 have been fully considered, and are persuasive. The Mazer et al. (US 2004/0133079) reference is excluded as prior art in a 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection as per 35 U.S.C. 103(c). Thus, the rejections of all claims based upon the combination including Mazar (all pending claims) are withdrawn. However, new art has been found, and the claims are rejected as described above. This action is made Non-Final.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TIMOTHY MUSSELMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-1814. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 6:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on (571)272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/642,998 Page 5

Art Unit: 3715

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-

/T. M./ Examiner of Art Unit 3715

1000.

/XUAN M. THAI/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3715